

The Sun

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 1914.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month..... \$0.50
 DAILY, Per Year..... 6.00
 SUNDAY, Per Month..... .25
 SUNDAY (to Canada), Per Month..... .40
 SUNDAY, Per Year..... 3.00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year..... 8.00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month..... .75

FOREIGN RATES.

DAILY, Per Month..... 1.25
 SUNDAY, Per Month..... .65
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month..... 1.00
 THE EVENING SUN, Per Month..... .25
 THE EVENING SUN, Per Year..... 2.50
 THE EVENING SUN (Foreign), Per Mo. 1.02

Readers of The Sun leaving town for the summer months can have the daily and Sunday and evening editions delivered to them in any part of this country or Europe on the terms stated above. Address changes as often as desired. Order through newsdealer or directly of Publication Office, telephone 1200, Beckman.

All checks, money orders, etc., to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published daily, including Sunday, by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer, William C. Reick, 170 Nassau street; Vice-President, Edward P. Mitchell, 170 Nassau street; Secretary, C. E. Linton, 170 Nassau street.

London office, Edinburgh House, 1 Arundel street, Strand.
 Paris office, 6 Rue de la Michodière, off Rue du Quatre Septembre.
 Washington office, 1105 Building.
 Brooklyn office, 106 Livingston street.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts and illustrations for publication wish to have rejected articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

An Indian Pipe Dream.

Our neighbor the World emits these beautiful and instructive sentiments:

"Permanent peace in Mexico is not to be secured by parleys. It must be fortified by deeds. It is to be guaranteed by the liberation of the people, by their possession of the land, by enlightened government and by the unselfish assistance of the people of the United States."

A large order and a long contract. One of the most difficult campaigns of education. Divide the great estates and public lands into small holdings. Wipe out the debts that keep the peasants in the gable. Good. But who is to liberate them from the habits of generations, to insure their possession, to free them from pulque and the natural as well as the Indian desire not to do any more work than they have to, to substitute prudence for age long improvidence, to repress gambling? Who is to give them, if they are to have a hand in the government, a government more enlightened than its illiterate source?

And what is "the unselfish assistance," destined to what warm welcome from its beneficiaries can be imagined, "of the people of the United States" to be? Is it permanent occupation? Is it a protectorate? Who guarantees this "guaranteed" liberty and land possession? There will be some sort of joint resolution by Congress, we suppose; and the character, the temperance will be made over thereby.

Otherwise some hundreds of years might be needed for the task; and the United States might not have leisure or means for neighborhood settlement work.

Cuba Under President Menocal.

A year ago to-day General MARIO MENOCAL was inaugurated as President of the republic of Cuba. In no other year in the last twenty, since 1894, has there been presented to American readers less news from Cuba, less comment on Cuban affairs and conditions. This fact, however, is not to be interpreted as indicative of official inactivity. On the contrary, General Menocal has done much, but he has done it quietly and tactfully. There have been no spectacular displays of power or policy, and there have been no startling or seriously disturbing scandals. There has been nothing to inspire sensational newspaper treatment.

The efforts of President MENOCAL, efforts so obvious that they have been overlooked, have been directed toward the conduct of an honest and efficient administration in the island. He has indulged in no dreams of an immediate correction of all existing evils, an immediate establishment of an ideal government. His most spectacular act was in connection with the so-called Ports Improvement Company, a \$10,000,000 concern organized under the previous administration in flagrant violation of the laws of the island, and declared by the Supreme Court to be without legal existence. Two or three other concerns call for and may receive similar attention.

Until the official accounts have been presented it is impossible to say how far General MENOCAL has succeeded in his efforts to conduct an economical government, a proceeding perhaps even more difficult in Cuba than in this country. Should it appear that he has failed in his purposes in that direction, no one in the United States can with grace or propriety point any finger of scorn at him. The indications are that he has attained some measure of success. The notable features of his administration have been honesty and a broad patriotism. His policies and his acts have been national and not partisan, and there is ground for hope if not for belief that his conduct and his high principles will exert a wholesome and enduring influence. They have at least deserved a larger attention and support in this country than has been accorded them.

Economically the island has suffered somewhat from trade depression. The sugar crop, on which the island depends largely for its commercial activity, was enormous, but prices verged on the disastrous. The crop of 1913 exceeded the crop of 1912 by 555,000 tons, but the

returns from exports, constituting approximately 95 per cent. of the output, were about \$28,000,000 below the returns of 1912. The present low retail price of sugar, here and in all other countries, is due not to change in our tariff on sugar, but to a glut in the world's sugar supply. From that glut and the consequent low price of raw sugar the Cuban producers have suffered severely. There was also a shrinkage in the tobacco industry. Cuba's product of importance next to sugar. The immediate situation is unfortunate but not yet to be regarded as seriously alarming. The crop season now closing shows little or no improvement over its predecessor.

To Cuba's President on his record for the year The SUN extends its compliments and its best wishes.

Competency as Exemplified by Secretary Bryan.

While the delegates to the Democratic convention of 1912 were demonstrating over the nomination of a candidate for President those who held membership in the committee on resolutions enjoyed a calm and peaceful existence. Their fellow platform maker, WILLIAM J. BRYAN of Nebraska, volunteered to do all the work, and did it. Mr. BRYAN let it be known that his presence at Baltimore was due to three ambitions.

He wanted a campaign committee which would not "bushwhack" the candidate. He wanted to help bring about the nomination of a progressive for President. He desired the adoption of a progressive platform. Throughout the deliberations of the committee on resolutions the declaration of party principles was known as the "Bryan platform." Mr. BRYAN's ascendancy in its preparation was recognized by all. That he was pleased with it the subjoined excerpts from his numerous outgivings on this subject two years ago afford convincing evidence:

"In knowing what the platform is we feel that it will help him [the nominee] in his fight."

"It is the most progressive platform ever framed in a Democratic convention."

"That means it is the most progressive platform ever adopted in this country."

"It is a stem winder, and the people will respond to it."

"It is a remarkable document."

"The unanimity with which it was accepted was inspiring."

"On the questions of party principles the Democrats this year are apparently in accord."

These enthusiastic phrases and many others of a similar tenor were used by Mr. BRYAN when the platform was warmly under his hand, at the time he and Senator O'GORMAN were busy as a sub-committee of the sub-committee of eleven in whipping it into shape. In his remarks there is no hint of concealed purposes, unperfected declarations, no suggestion that convention, committee or sub-committee did not know exactly what they were about.

Yet to-day the same BRYAN, dignified by the title of Secretary of State, records in his personal newspaper the repudiation of a plank of that platform by the men who composed that convention as a triumph of Democracy and a renunciation of a false, dishonest and indefensible doctrine. In his *Commoner*, over his own signature, Secretary BRYAN writes thus:

"BALTIMORE CONVENTION AGAINST FREE TOLLS."

"Senator GORE has made a poll of the delegates to the Baltimore convention of 1912 and has so far received answer from 845 delegates out of the 1,100."

"Of those voting 652 favor the repeal of the free tolls law, 125 are against repeal and 38 are noncommittal."

"The advocates of repeal therefore number more than 130 in excess of a majority; that is to say, if the convention were now in session and the question were put up to the delegates, the advocates of repeal would have a majority of more than 260 even if all of those who have not voted and those who answer noncommittal were counted with the opponents."

"This would seem to be a conclusive answer to those who in spite of the plank against subsidies regard the free tolls plank as binding on the party."

"W. J. BRYAN."

The career of WILLIAM J. BRYAN has been rich in contradictions and absurdities. His untrustworthiness as a counselor and guide has been frequently exposed. Among the incidents that have discredited his judgment and exhibited his incapacity surely none is more extraordinary than the disclosure of his incompetency which is involved in the history of the Panama tolls plank of the Democratic platform of 1912.

The Peace Conference.

As the A B C mediation conference opens at Niagara Falls it may be assumed that the eminent advocates who represent the provisional Government in Mexico are men of patriotic purpose and have the welfare of the whole country at heart. Have they come so far to deliver the message that under no circumstances will General HUERTA retire from the Presidency? It may be taken for granted that they bear instructions contemplating his stepping aside upon conditions proposed by him that find favor with his supporters.

Masterful as he is in character and temper, General HUERTA cannot rule alone; he must consider the interests of those from whom he derives his power, and they constitute the conservative element in Mexico. Senator ROBERTSON and his associates represent this element and are not mere pawns of General HUERTA. It is not to be supposed that they will lay their cards face up on the table, but they must have a plan of settlement subject to modifications in a peace conference such as the Ambassadors of Argentina, Brazil and Chile have called. This obviously is not General HUERTA's individual proposal in the nature of an ultimatum, but what the conservative element in Mexico has to offer to bring the civil war to an end and establish a Government which the Constitutional

ists may accept and the United States recognize.

President WILSON also has a plan that will be presented by Mr. Justice LAMAR and Mr. LEHMANN, the delegates of the United States. If that plan were baldly the elimination of General HUERTA as head of the provisional Government in Mexico the conference might as well not meet. It may be assumed that the retirement of President HUERTA is an incident only of Mr. WILSON's programme of "permanent settlement," and that no objection will be made to the dictator's saving his face. In the beginning the respective schemes of government conditioned upon war ceasing in Mexico will probably be far apart, and the fact that the Constitutionalists are not represented makes the work of the conference perplexingly difficult but by no means a forlorn hope.

Success will depend mainly upon guarantees given by the United States to the reform as well as to the conservative element in Mexico and upon concessions made by President HUERTA's supporters and endorsed by the United States. The effect of the continuation of the struggle in the field upon the deliberations of the conference cannot be foreseen. A series of quickly won victories and rapid advances by the insurgent commanders would probably render the conference abortive; but a stubborn resistance by the Federal forces as they were drawn in toward the capital should, in protracting the campaign, prove favorable to compromise and the final success of the mediators.

What the Police Are For.

City Chamberlain BRUERE is a spokesman of "a science of public administration" is trying to irradiate the police with the light of that science:

"The policemen should keep their eyes fixed upon their work. The traffic men are the most blessed, for their work is along constructive and educational lines, whereas the other members of the force deal mostly with repression. What is needed is for the policemen to feel that they have the opportunity to do a great work in the betterment of social conditions."

All sciences are now a part of one stupendous whole, "social service." But since the duty of the police is the enforcement of the laws and the repression of crime, it is upon that and not upon social betterment that their eyes should be fixed. If members of the force could be strictly and steadily held to that work it would be the best "social service" they could do and the only one justly to be expected of them. Their duty seems simple enough, yet it has not always been fulfilled. The force, now largely composed of clean young men who are remote from the scandals of the past, must be often puzzled as to what is expected from it by its superiors. Hitherto, for the most part, a spasmodic and often sensational insistence upon the enforcement of non-enforcement of certain laws has seemed to be the policy of the department.

"Raid" gambling houses and poolrooms, to prevent people from eating and drinking as late as they like to, at rare intervals to make a demonstration against Sunday opening of liquor shops; a feverish intermittent expenditure of police energy on magnified non-essentials has been the rule.

Under the present administration a greater sense of proportion is to be hoped and has been indicated. To preserve public order and the security of life and property, to prevent and detect crime; this is the business of the police. They should be honest, humane, intelligent, polite; but they have a definite office and scope of employment. They are not missionaries or settlement workers or uplifters. If they will "deal mostly with repression," if without overzealous fussiness and pragmatic interference they will do their plain duty, they will as a matter of fact do a good deal for the "betterment of social conditions." The favorite American way of bettering social conditions is to howl for and pass more laws, while the old ones sleep toothless on the statute books.

Retirement or Reemployment?

Senator ROOT's strong desire and resolve to leave public life at the end of his term in the Senate are well known. His life has been crowded with unremitting labor. In his profession and in his career he has had enough of honors. Natural and to be respected is his wish for some respite and repose at 70, his age next year, after such varied and fruitful toil.

But the Republican party and the country may well protest against this deserved furlough. Where else shall they look for the mastery of public business, the knowledge of constitutional and international law, the long experience, the unerring judgment, the authority of a great intellect in its prime applied to affairs?

The Republican party needs Mr. ROOT. Congress and the country need indispensably his knowledge, sagacity, prudence, patriotism and wisdom. It must be admitted with regret that in regard to foreign affairs the Administration is sadly to seek. The Senate is by no means rich, in fact lamentably scanty, in high talents and statesmanlike capacities. It cannot spare ELIHU ROOT.

The "Stage" Name in Opera.

A writer in the Providence *Journal* recently made the death of Mme. Novicka the foundation for some comment on the use of stage names in the operatic world, and declared that it was no longer necessary for a singer to assume a foreign name in order to secure a public success. True, it was at one time the general custom to adopt an Italian name if one intended to make a career in Italian opera; but there were always exceptions. Even in Europe, where Italian opera reigned from Berlin to Naples, Italian names were not always used.

The first of the famous tenors was

ANTON RAFF, who sang in the eighteenth century. MALIBRAND managed to get on without a final "I," and LACCHINI, the great basso, succeeded with a French name. In recent years two distinguished Americans, CLARA LOUISE KELLOGG and ANNIE LOUISE CARY, rose to the top without changing their names; and of course SIMS HEEVES and CHARLES SANTLEY must be remembered for the glory of Britain.

But perhaps so far as this country is concerned the custom of giving operas with the original texts and the consequent assembling of companies of singers of various nationalities has done more than anything else to abolish the custom of changing names. From the Metropolitan Opera House the habitual use of the real name spread through Europe, and now Americans use American names, singing in Berlin, Rome or Vienna.

The ruling of Secretary GARRISON that even the small details of army news may be given to the newspapers only from his own lips is discouraging. The Secretary has heretofore been regarded as representing the element of common sense in President WILSON's Cabinet.

New Yorkers need not be mortified that so few of them are abroad after 1 o'clock as to make it unprofitable to pay for an all night license. It is not any longer possible to interest the citizens exclusively in the refreshment, liquid and otherwise, that such places have to offer. That may have been possible in the past. Now there must be an additional attraction, and that has come to be the inevitable dance. We have yet to hear of a hall with a dancing license that found it unprofitable to "keep open" until 2 o'clock.

A SORRED URBAN BUOLIC.

Cleaning Yards of Twigs and Leaves No Sweet Pastoral Task.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: "Once Rural," whose letter on the clearing of country yards of leaves and twigs appeared in The SUN of May 17, shall finally decide to "move back into the city." He has had a year to "get clean," let him come down to this detestable country and I shall give to him just such a job as he seems to love.

For two weeks I have been engaged, in removing dead leaves and twigs from around my place, and I am prepared to say that it is about as "rotten" a job as can be imposed upon any man. It is a most unattractive and odious from the "freshest" of which "Once Rural" is so enthusiastic, to most people they must be only second to the fumes of a tannery.

But this is not the edge of a forest, and every spring the leaves lie about knee deep for several hundred feet round about; so the magnitude of the removal may be appreciated. One cannot cut his cake and have it too, nor shut out his light and still possess it.

There are evidently but two ways of securing light for close quarters.

One is to limit sufficiently the height of the buildings, or else—

Separate them so as to let in the air and light. The former plan is used in the most modern cities of Europe, and the average height is 82 feet.

In the Height of Buildings Commission's report there is a table of the height limits in twenty-five great cities of Europe, and the average is 67½ feet.

The plan suggested by the commission would permit the covering of about 30 per cent. of the area of the lot to a height of certain times and probably four times as great as the European cities, after hundreds of years of experience, have found it wise to allow. Is it really so impracticable for New York, and if so, why?

Can any one point to a single disadvantage of high buildings, as enumerated above, which would be overcome by the adoption of the plan of the commission? Their good features, which can be retained by the adoption of that plan?

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

HIGH BUILDINGS.

A Protest Against the Proposed Plan of Regulation.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: The adoption of a plan for the regulation of the height and area of buildings is a matter of the highest importance to the city, for it is likely to influence profoundly its future growth and welfare. It is a subject which should be studied from every standpoint and in all its bearings.

The Height of Buildings Commission has presented an able and elaborate report containing information of great value for use in arriving at a wise decision; but the commission itself has reached conclusions which appear to represent but a single point of view, for they are in direct conflict with the uniform practice of all European cities, with much of the evidence of their own report, and with the opinion of many who have given careful study here to the subject.

In the report of the commission we find that the height of a lot of 10,000 square feet in Manhattan is 1,341 feet, or as high as ten stories, that is to say, less than one and one-third per cent. of the total; but even this comparatively small percentage of high buildings has produced conditions which are fast becoming intolerable. Regulations for their correction should certainly be made, but it is only reasonable to demand that when made the height of a building should be effective in accomplishing its object. Is the plan proposed by the Height of Buildings Commission of that nature?

By attempting to answer this question, let us briefly enumerate the chief causes of complaint against high buildings and take note of the evident disadvantages and advantages which acquaintances with them are inclined to recognize.

The two great congestions of the streets, the shutting out of sun and light from streets and buildings.

Increase in the fire risk owing to the spread of flames from one building to another and the high building to another and the difficulty of fighting fire at such great altitudes.

Injustice as between neighboring property owners in the preemption of light.

The inflation of values within certain narrow limits at the expense of the surrounding land.

The congestion which these inflated values impose on the land owner to build and add to the congestion to escape ruin by taxation.

The displacement of the city. By the fact that not a few of the lots along with the high buildings have their good points, which must be taken into account to form a fair basis for comparison.

When not too close together they afford most agreeable, healthful and desirable quarters.

They increase the available floor area. They increase the value of land, permitting greater use to be made of it.

They swell the city's tax roll. Some of them are very good looking and have come to be regarded as distinctive types of architecture.

An examination of these two lists will show that all the evils of high buildings with perhaps the one exception of ugliness, are not overcrowding, while all their good qualities are dependent upon not overcrowding; we may therefore safely conclude that no plan which permits the crowding together of high buildings is likely to be successful.

There are evidently but two ways of securing light for close quarters. One is to limit sufficiently the height of the buildings, or else—

Separate them so as to let in the air and light. The former plan is used in the most modern cities of Europe, and the average height is 82 feet.

In the Height of Buildings Commission's report there is a table of the height limits in twenty-five great cities of Europe, and the average is 67½ feet.

The plan suggested by the commission would permit the covering of about 30 per cent. of the area of the lot to a height of certain times and probably four times as great as the European cities, after hundreds of years of experience, have found it wise to allow. Is it really so impracticable for New York, and if so, why?

Can any one point to a single disadvantage of high buildings, as enumerated above, which would be overcome by the adoption of the plan of the commission? Their good features, which can be retained by the adoption of that plan?

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

These are questions which cannot be answered by the commission. The plan permits of the crowding together of high buildings. If adopted it must fail, because it is based on the false assumption that high buildings can be crowded together without further and more probable than a failure and actually aggravate and intensify present evils.

URGES REFORMS LED BY MANUFACTURERS.

Cheney Points to Col. Mulhall as Lesson to National Association.

CRITICISM IS APPLAUDED.

Convention Will End To-night With Big Dinner at the Waldorf.

The National Association of Manufacturers listened to plain talk yesterday from Howell Cheney of Cheney Bros., who did not mince words regarding the troubles of the association last fall when Congress was investigating the role of lobbying spun by the Col. Mulhall.

"If we at all times had lived up to the social ideal of bearing our part of the responsibility for the finding of a solution of the common and general problems we would not have been placed in the position of defendants of special interests," Mr. Cheney said to the men on whose factories 15,000,000 Americans depend for a living.